



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/980,199	03/08/2002	Detlev Neuland	3868-0104P	9426
2292	7590	12/17/2004	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			HAMILTON, ISAAC N	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3724		

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/980,199	NEULAND ET AL. <i>On</i>
Examiner	Art Unit	
Isaac N Hamilton	3724	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 7-12 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 7-12 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In light of the specification and drawings it is not clear how the vacuum conveyor channels function to allow the strips to lead together at the end of the channel. It is not clear how plates 13 and 14 create a vacuum channel, nor is it clear how the strips are lead together at the end of the channel because Figure 3 clearly shows the strips together at the beginning of the channel.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 7-9, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ring (5,374,042) in view of Faasse, Jr. (4,556,441), and further in view of Pohjola (5,224,405) and Bakker (5,193,423). Ring discloses a broad web of sheet-like material 10; multiple circular

knife roll 56, 52, 50, 54; turned by about 90 degrees on its way to conveyor channel in figure 1; strip 16 turns 90 degrees upward immediately after being cut from strip 18; strip 18 turns 90 degrees downward immediately after being cut from strip 18; strips are lead on top of each other in figure 1 adjacent element 68. Ring does not disclose manufacturing a medicinal and/or any active substance containing product, a roll on a take-up mandrel, a vacuum roll, or a vacuum conveyor channel. Faasse, Jr. teaches manufacturing medicinal and/or any active substance containing product in figure 10. It would have been obvious to provide manufacturing a medicinal and/or any active substance containing product in Ring as taught by Faasse, Jr. in order to apply web separator and deflector technology to a wide range of products. Note in Faasse, Jr. roll 54; take-up mandrel in figure 1 at the center of roll 54; medicinal substance containing products in column 2, lines 25-48; dermal patches in column 1, lines 9-15; active substance containing sheet-like administration forms in column 1, lines 56-68. Pohjola teaches a vacuum roll 32. It would have been obvious to provide a vacuum anvil roll in the combination of Ring and Faasse, Jr. in order to replace the tractor feed devices 36 in Ring so that the apparatus can convey various web structures. Bakker teaches vacuum conveyor channel 21. It would have been obvious to provide a vacuum conveyor channel in the combination of Ring and Faasse, Jr. in order to replace the tractor feeder 70 in Ring so that the apparatus can convey various web structures.

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Ring, Faasse, Jr., Pohjola and Bakker, as applied to claims 7-9, 11 and 12 above, and further in view of Mlododeniec et al (4,349,531), hereafter Mlododeniec. The combination discloses everything as noted above, but does not disclose administration forms for oral application.

However, Mlodzeniec teaches administration form for oral application in column 3, lines 40-44. It would have been obvious to provide application forms for oral application in the combination as taught by Mlodzeniec in order to provide various products to consumers.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isaac Hamilton whose telephone number is 571-272-4509. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday between 8am and 5pm. If attempts to

reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 571-272-4514.

In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that all formal responses be faxed to 703-872-9306.

11

IH
December 13, 2004

Ba, M
BOYER ASHLEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER